

### **Remarks**

This is a response to the office action mailed February 5, 2007. Claims 1-13 were filed in this application. The outstanding office rejects claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang and Claims 1-2, 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tsukamoto. Claims 1-2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kremer in view of Wang. By this amendment, Applicant has sought to address the issues raised by the Examiner and it is believed to put the case in condition for allowance consistent with the outstanding office action.

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled and the limitations contained therein added to claim 1.

Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 11-13 have been canceled and the limitations contained therein added to claim 10. Dependent claims 14 and 15 are new.

It is respectfully submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has remaining concerns regarding patentability, he is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly resolved and the case passed on to issuance.

Please charge the two month extension of time fee and any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**Tommy Milne**

By /John E. Nemazi/  
John E. Nemazi  
Reg. No. 30,876  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 28, 2007

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351